

**THE EVOLUTION OF RADICAL RHETORIC: RADICAL BABY BOOMER
DISCOURSE ON FACEBOOK IN THE 21ST CENTURY**

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE

OF

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

EDWIN FAUNCE

ADVISOR: JAMES W. CHESEBRO

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, INDIANA

MAY 2012

Table of Contents

Title Page	1
Table of Contents	2
Dedication	3
Acknowledgement	4
Chapter 1: The Problem	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review	11
Chapter 3: Method	24
Chapter 4: Boomer Profile Analysis Conclusions	47
Chapter 5: Final Conclusions, Limitations, and Recommendations	58
Works Cited	68
Appendix	74

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my children, Rachel and Abigail, with my love and admiration.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I want to thank and acknowledge my advisor, and committee chair James W. Chesebro Ph.D. for his guidance, and extreme hard work coaching and helping me figure out what was in my head. Next, I want to also thank my committee members. I want to thank Michael Holmes Ph.D. for his continued thoughtful and incisive input to this thesis from when it was just an idea ruminating in my head up to the work that you see before you. I want to thank Melinda Messineo Ph.D. for her encouragement and help to focus on my topic while I was assembling this thesis proposal. Thank you all for your stellar work on this thesis committee.

I would like to acknowledge Michael Gerhard Ph.D. for his direction and encouragement, and also thank the rest of my master's cohort for listening to the many pedantic papers and lectures they had to endure on the subject of the elderly on Facebook.

I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of Joanne Henry Crawford for having to endure many evenings as a sounding board for this thesis topic.

Finally I would like to acknowledge Robert Strikwerda Ph.D. who set me on this path to study the frail, yet resilient ageing human condition.

Chapter 1: The Problem

In the nineteen-year span of time, just after World War II, over 70 million babies were born in the United States. Known as the “Baby Boom” generation, when these Americans came of age in the late 1960’s their generation was considered a group of “inner fixated idealists”(Howe & Strauss, 1991). Boomer’s believed they had “a unique vision, a transcendent principle, a moral acuity more wondrous and extensive than anything ever sensed in the history of mankind”(p. 11). By the time the first Boomers reached their college years in the late 1960’s, a smaller, committed group of radical Boomer idealists emerged to form a political movement that advocated extreme political changes in the United States. Known as the New Left, these archetypical idealists participated in actions designed to express their ideals through active political protest, subverting established culture, and the use of extreme violence. Hoffer (1951) termed them “true believers”, whose “faith in the future” enabled them to embrace sweeping change (p. 5). Radical Boomer ideology rejected the previous generation’s core political and social values. During the 1960’s and 1970’s, Boomer radical rhetoric, along with violent confrontations was credited with affecting the entire political social and economic fabric of America (Katsiaficas, 1987). During the late 1960’s young radical iconoclasts rallied their individual groups to violent

protest of American involvement in the Vietnam War. With massive marches, “sit-in” occupations of government buildings, and violent criminal behavior, Boomer radicals rhetorically and literally declared their own “war” on American culture, their parents, and their government (Hinckle, 1971). Forty-four years later, America is still dealing with the same social and political issues. Deeply involved in foreign conflicts, America today still faces race, gender, sexual, and economic inequalities. It seems that America and much of the rest of the world has yet to embrace the tenets of the New Left: socialism, participatory democracy, humanism, community identity, and existentialism (Chesebro, 1972). How then are the radical revolutionary founders of the American New Left expressing themselves on these issues today? What kind of actions, if any, does the Boomers that shaped the “counter culture” revolution (Roszak, 1969) use today to elicit social, political and cultural change?

America is involved in a communication technology “boom” (Pew, 2010). With advances in Internet and wireless based devices, technology users live out their lives both socially and politically using web-based platforms like Twitter and Facebook. With almost 900 million users, Facebook has connected almost every corner of the world (Helft, 2010) into its ever-growing social media platform. Recent world events revealed the huge potential of social media to elicit social and political change (Vargas, 2011). With this ability to realize the cultural transformations they sought at their fingertips, how then do radical Boomers in the 21st century express themselves on their Facebook profiles?

Scope and Purpose of Study

This thesis reveals the actions and rhetorical style Baby Boomer radicals utilize on their Facebook profiles to promote radical political agendas. (Facebook usage is typically synonymous with the Millennial Generation, whose use of social media still eclipses that of any other generation [Pew, 2010], and was the predominant early adopter of social media platforms). However the second fastest developing demographic group that regularly uses Facebook is Baby Boomers, age 55 and up. According to the Pew report, significant portions of the Boomer Generation are Facebook users (Pew, 2010, p. 1). Pew's Aaron Smith noted that "The social networking population as a whole has grown larger and demographically more diverse in recent years, and the same is true when it comes to political activity on social networking sites... These platforms are now utilized by politically active individuals of all ages and ideologies to get news, connect with others, and offer their thoughts on the issues that are important to them"(Smith, 2011, p. 2). This evidence points to a politically active and diverse base of Facebook users. Much has been written about Boomer radicals in their younger days. There is, however, a gap in present research on Baby Boomer radicals who may still promote extreme political ideals and adhere to radical rhetorical style on their Facebook profiles. This study addresses that gap in research by answering these questions:

RQ1: What are the major actions Boomer radicals use to express their radical ideology on Facebook?

RQ2: Are there differences in the rhetorical styles used to promote radical ideology in radical Boomer Facebook profiles?

RQ3: Are there differences in specific actions or rhetorical styles on Facebook between older, early Boomers (born 1946-1952), and younger, later Boomers (born 1953-1964).

A Small and Committed Group

Of Facebook's 850 million members, approximately 122 million are from the United States (Hogsdon, 2012). Though Boomer Generation usage of Facebook is on the rise, Boomer Generations increases are still eclipsed by the increases of Millennials in Facebook membership (Pew, 2010). During the 1960's and 1970's only a small number of Boomers espoused radical political ideology (Hinckle, 1971). This small radical group popularized the term "power to the people" when referring to the transfer of governmental power away from the hierarchical "establishment" (Horowitz, 1972, p. 53). As previously mentioned, Facebook, and other social media have recently exemplified that maxim in helping change some established governments in the Middle East, eliciting political and social change (Vargas, 2011, p. 1). The idea of a small, committed ideological group represented on a social network with over a half-billion users does merit consideration for research. Though small in numbers, radical Boomer outreach potential could be enormous. This thesis explores how Boomer radicals use their Facebook social presence to maintain a radical ideological influence in American society.

Prologue

Chapter one introduces this study as an attempt to find, analyze, and categorize the content on radical Boomer Facebook profiles. This paper will focus the American Boomer Generation members who promote radical political ideology in their Facebook profiles. Chapter 2 begins with discussion of the validity of Facebook profiles in deducing individual political ideological identity. Next, this chapter looks at Strauss and Howe's *Generations* (1991), a study that looked at 600 years of American generational cycles. This generational study showed a repeating cycle of generational characteristics that identify the Baby Boom generation as idealistic, action oriented, internally driven individuals (Howe & Strauss, 1991, p. 37). Discussed next will be the ideals of the New Left's "counter culture" (Roszak, 1969) which took rhetoric from speech to action in the streets, and sometimes living rooms, of America in the 1960's (Horowitz, 1971). Next in chapter 2 is a short review of Bernard L. Brock's (1965) dissertation, *A Description of Four Political Positions and a Description of Their Rhetorical Characteristics*. Following that review, this chapter looks at a companion book, *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Language in Democracy* by Brock, Huglen, Klumpp and Howell (2005). The later publication revisits and updates Brock's original study, categorizing political ideologies using Kenneth Burke's "dramatist" method. Brock et al. (2005) introduces two key concepts in their system for delineating political ideology, the *usage of social institutions* and *the drift of society* (p. 75). Next Chapter 2 looks at how the

development of the early Internet reflected “Marxist ideals of the counterculture” (Lanier, 2010). Also covered is how Internet communication utilizes “anarcho-communism (Barbrook, 2001), combining libertarianism with what Barbrook referred to as “a gift economy” (p. 1). Finally, chapter two reviews Chesebro’s “Rhetorical Strategies of the Radical Revolutionary” (1972). Chesebro defines and categorizes the philosophy and rhetoric of the radical revolutionary in the aftermath of violent confrontations of the New Left in Chicago and Columbia University in 1968. Chesebro noted that examination of radical rhetorical characteristics shifted “from the intellectual to action agents of the New Left as they engage in actual confrontation with established systems” (p. 37).

Chapter three will look at the method for using Brock et al. (2005) in identifying political ideology typology, and Chesebro’s (1972) revolutionary radical rhetorical classifications in analyzing the convenience sample of Facebook profiles. Chapter four will reveal the results of the study, and will answer the three research questions. Chapter five will look at study conclusions, limitations of the study, and suggest future research on this subject.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter first discusses the validity of online personal profiles, rationalizing the use of Facebook profiles for the study of radical rhetoric. Next, the chapter identifies the political uses of Facebook to disseminate political ideology and the exponential growth since 2009 of the Baby Boom generation population on Facebook. Also reviewed is Strauss and Howe's (1991) generational cycle study that characterized the Baby Boomer as an "idealist" generational group (p. 36). Further noted is how the Boomers idealistic demands for extreme change created a "counter culture" (Roszak, 1969) inciting the revolutionaries of the late 1960's to direct political and cultural action. This chapter then reveals how radical Boomer demands for a more equitable political system infused radical ideology into the network that social media now operates the Internet (Lanier, 2001). Following that is a review, *A Description of Four Political Positions and a Description of Their Rhetorical Characteristics* (1965), and *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Democracy* (2005). The latter book by Brock et al. forms the basis for the methodology used in identifying radical content on Facebook profiles. Finally Chesebro's (1972) article, *Rhetorical Strategies of Revolutionary Radicals* identifies five categories of

rhetorical strategies used by radical revolutionaries to accompanied revolutionary actions in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Facebook Profile Validity

Nakamura (2009) has indicated that textual avatars like Facebook profiles are, "the embodiment, in text and/or graphic images, of a user's online presence in social spaces"(p. 33). A Facebook profile "embodies" (p.33) many attributes of the physical self behind the profile's creation. It also has a standardized format, with status updates and *like* buttons that are designed intrinsically into the interface. Turkle (1998) points out that "The projection of self onto the computational media is as consistent, as it is dramatic" (p. vi). This projection has come to be accepted as a representation of the profile creator, a virtual living entity (p. 105). This representation is stalwart, available twenty-four hours a day in a virtual space. Biocca (2001) talks about this "social presence" (p. 43) in which those that view a virtual representative "Perceive access to another intelligence"(p. 44). In that way, profiles on Facebook can then project the presence of the profile user into the virtual public space. Goffman (1959) agrees with this in his idea of "co-presence" (p. 143), the recognition of another being in the same space. Chesebro, (2002) referred to an individual's online existence as a "telepresence... a second mediated reality" (p. 5). According to Mehdizadeh (2006), Facebook profiles have the capability to reveal more personal information than initial face-to-face meetings can generate,

“With web sites, such as Facebook... users can make public ‘identity statements’ they may not normally do offline. These statements can take both explicit (i.e., autobiographic descriptions) and implicit (i.e., photographs) forms and ultimately enable people to stage a public display of their hoped-for possible selves” (p. 4).

Profiles have hyper-validity

Facebook profiles can be a more true representation of self in these public virtual spaces, and being able to express one’s political ideology becomes an important part of our projection into cyberspace. It is as important in the virtual space as it is in our lives off-line. Goffman’s (1964) idea of a dramaturgical “presentation of self” (p. 3) seems easily facilitated in the construction of Facebook’s profile information platform with its many self-identifying categories for the user to fill in. One of these fill in the blank categories is identified as *political views*. This is one of many *tokens* that Lui (2007) refers to that profile owner’s identify with, and use to shape their online image (pg. 1).

Identifying users

The Pew Internet and American Life project reveals over half of American adults used the Internet for “political purposes” in the last election (Pew, 2011). Pew statistics indicates 22 percent of social media users, including Twitter users promote political positions on the platforms (p. 1). In the 2008 Presidential election social media has been credited with helping to elect Barack Obama (Carr,

2008). Andrew Rasiej, a former technical advisor to Presidential candidate Howard Dean, asserts the 2012 national election “...will be the first election in modern history that both parties are understanding the potential of the technology to change the results of the election” (Preston quoting Rasiej, 2011). Rasiej adds politicians “are no longer skeptical of its potential” (p. 2).

In December of 2010 Facebook revealed that the fastest growing user group in the previous 120 days had been 55-year-old women (Smith, 2009). The second fastest growing age group on Facebook from July of 2009 to August of 2010 was those individuals 55 and up, with a 65% increase (Pew, 2010). A 2010 AARP study found that over 23% of those over the age of 50 using social networking sites preferred Facebook to other forms of social media (Rodgers, p. 6).

The Boomer Generation

Boomers, those born in the United States from 1946 to 1964 (Howe & Strauss, 1991), have “metamorphosed from Beaver Cleaver to hippie to brat eater to yuppie to what some are calling ‘Neo- Puritan’ in a manner quite unlike what anyone, themselves included ever expected” (p. 299). Boomers have adapted and in many ways co-opted Facebook, making it their new virtual home (Gates, 2009). The Boomer presence on Facebook brings with it the Boomer’s outspoken political attitudes. “Boomers have been shown also to express their politics, wherever they are. They are representative of their politics” (Steinhorn, 2006).

Generations Boomer cycle

Strauss and Howe (1991) stated that Boomers have “been the cultural and spiritual focal point for American society as a whole” (p. 301) in the late 20th century. This large demographic has by its very size been a formidable force economically and politically for the last 47 years (Riggs, 2009). Strauss and Howe’s generational cycle identifies the Boomers as “inner fixated idealists” (Howe & Strauss 1991, p. 11) If you were a Boomer radical your motto was “You build it up Mother, we are going to tear it down” (p. 299). Known as “self-absorbed, self-directed” (p. 301) Boomers acted with a new political identity of their own predominantly “seen their mission not as constructing a society, but of justifying, purifying, even sanctifying it.” (p. 301). With religious fervor bordering on the fanatical, Hoffer’s (1951) description of a “true believer” represents radical Boomers of the 1960’s and 1970’s. Self-directed and wholly committed, Boomer radicals were able to convince older generations of their gravitas by organizing massive protest marches, sit-ins and violent confrontations (Chesebro, 1972).

The making of a counter culture

Roszak (1969) wrote that, “For better or worse, most of what is presently happening that is new, provocative and engaging in politics...is the creation... of youth who are profoundly, even fanatically alienated from the parental generation...It is the young who find themselves cast as the only effective radical opposition within their societies” (pp. 1- 2). Strauss and Howe (1991) indicated

that only small portions of the entire Boomer generation were considered radical (p. 299). Dubbed "red diaper babies" (p. 299), this radical Boomer cohort knew how to move masses utilizing rhetorical and media savvy (Sloman, 1998). Radical movement leader Jerry Rubin stated that he would not be satisfied until it was revealed, "just how violent a country we live in" (Sloman, p. 25). Boomer radicals tapped into the desire for sweeping change to the political and social landscape of the country that American young people wanted, and were willing to use violence to achieve that goal (Hinckle, 1972).

By the 1990's however, Boomer radicals were mostly muted in their extremist rhetoric. A former Students for Democratic Society (SDS) leader stated in a 1990 interview "Now I don't know how to make a revolution; twenty years ago I did" (Braungart, Braungart, 1990). Peace activist and comedian Hugh Romney, known to the New Left as "Wavy Gravy" stated in a 1998 interview "There was a vacuum when the war ended. For some of us, that's what we were looking for, a little bit of a vacuum" (Sloman, 1998, Pg. 275).

Radical Technology

Late in the 20th Century, advances in technology led to the development of the personal computer. Americans started using their new machines to log into a network of former university and United States Defense Department computers known as the Internet. Some of the Internet's developers tried to ascribe New Left ideals with the new technology by stressing free universal access to it (Barbrook, 1996). Louis Rossetto, the founding editor of *Wired*

Magazine noted: "This new world [of the Net] is characterized by a new global economy that is inherently anti-hierarchical and decentralist, and that disrespects national boundaries or the control of politicians and bureaucrats... and by a global, networked consciousness... that is turning... bankrupt electoral politics... into a dead end." (p. 3) Technologist Jaron Lanier (2001) admitted, "Marx's ideas still color utopian technological thinking." (Lanier, p. 78) Though Barbrook (2001) notes the early Internet was still a government entity, but that those in charge realized that "the Net could only be successfully developed by letting the users build the system for themselves" (p. 3). Barbrook (1999) wryly points out that, "The invention of the Net was the greatest irony of the Cold War. At the height of the struggle against Stalinist communism, the US military unwittingly bankrolled the creation of cyber-communism" (p.5). Lanier (2001) states, "Marx was all about technological change...he argued that the playing field should be leveled before the technologies of abundance mature" (p. 77). Borsook in 1995 expressed the "open culture" of networking on the Internet at that time as,

"A kind of direct, populist democracy that most of us have never experienced: Not in democratically elected government, where too many layers of pols and polls and image and handling intervene. Not in radical politics, where too often, the same old alpha-male/top-dog politics prevail despite the countercultural objectives pursued. ... (The Internet) provides a counter-example of true grass roots political process that few

of us have ever the privilege to participate in... the real world of networking" (p. 1).

Lanier (2010) noted the Internet was at first an anarchistic open society, with paradoxically hierarchical rules (Lanier, 2010, p. 79). The ability to network and participate in a common public forum led to the creation of many opportunities for early programmers and bloggers, including one named Mark Zuckerberg. Zuckerberg's social media platform, Facebook, created a "community" centered on a "gift economy" (Kilpatrick, 2010, p. 287). "The whole culture works on this framework of giving... (What) binds the communities together and makes the potlatch work is the fact that the community is small enough that people can see each other's contributions" (p. 287). The *gifts* that Zuckerberg was speaking about the Facebook community giving to one another were *rhetoric*. "Think of giving your opinion as a gift to the polity" (p. 288). As Kilpatrick noted, "Facebook is now one of the first places people take their gripes, activism, and protest." (p. 289). Facebook seemed open and radical in its intentions, even though it functioned as highly standardized and hierarchical system. As Lanier (2010) explained the inherent radical ideologies present in online structures, "Classic Maoism didn't really reject hierarchy; it only suppressed any hierarchy that didn't happen to be in the power structure" (p.89).

This chapter now looks at *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Language in Democracy* (Brock, et al., 2005) to help develop a typology that can identify radical political ideology in Baby Boomer profiles of the 21st century.

Using Brock as an Analytical Tool.

According to Brock et al. (2005), the keys to ideological definition were how political ideologies reacted to two “functional”(p. 75) aspects of political positions. First, attitudes toward “structure” of a given event or policy and second, “societal drift” (p. 75). They stated, “All policies are implemented through an institutional structure...a loose combination of elements that have evolved over time” (p. 75). Brock et al. pointed out that the political middle (p.76) will accept the structure and will “define its attitudes toward change within it” (p.75). Liberals and conservatives (The political middle) will accept and use the institution, however different the goals of their positions might be. The extreme political positions, radical and reactionary however “reject some important elements of the structure” (p. 75).

As an example, Brock et al. (2005) used the institution of medical care provision in the United States. American conservatives and liberals both accepted the institution’s structure, a combination of private payers, insurance plans, and government funded programs like Medicare and Medicaid. The political middle attempted to make changes to either extend government involvement (expand Medicare services to more people), while the conservative positions attempted to restrict government involvement (privatize or introduce voucher systems for individuals) (p. 76).

The extreme political positions, radical and reactionary according to Brock et al., rejected the structure all together. Radicals demanded fully funded

government health care for all Americans, administrated by a completely new institution (p. 88). Reactionaries “view the entire policy as immoral and believe the government should rescind it” (p. 77), thus destroying the institution and returning to past options for health care provision.

The second element of political identification was that of the “drift of society” (p. 75), which noted societal changes in the perception of policy over time. Brock et al. (2005) stated, “Policy changes on a particular issue are not random but move in a perceivable direction” (p. 75). Brock (1965) noted that definitions of liberal and conservative positions in America’s Colonial period evolved to complete reverses of the same positions in the 1930’s New Deal policies (p. 31). To Brock, the attitude toward the acceptance and *direction* of drift identified political positions (Brock, et al, 2005). Liberals and radicals accepted drift and wanted to *accelerate* it. Conservatives and reactionary positions both rejected drift, attempting to *restrict* it or completely *reverse* it. Brock et al. pointed out “the level of attitude transcends particular policies and issues, thus providing a more stable definition of the political positions”(p. 76).

Brock et al. defined *radical* ideology as being “born out of an extreme dedication to liberalism”(p. 69). They described the Burkeian structural perspective of radicals by saying, “The radical examines the *scene* and identifies an instrument or *agency* which is central to the problem, this establishing an external orientation. In this way *structure* is important to the radical’s view of reality” (*Emphasis mine*) (p. 349-350)

The radical Boomers attitude of “Tear this Mother down” identified their relationship to the institutions themselves. As Brock et al (2005) point out “The radical looks at language choices and other rhetorical strategies to account for and change the existing structures and policies of society” (p.89). Hoffer (1951) noted that “The radical...loathe(s) the present. They see it as an aberration and a deformity” (p. 40). In 1972 activist Tom Hayden wrote that,

“The chief contradiction in America is between a moribund, decadent system and all those people with a stake in the future. Just at the moment when the system seems most exhausted in its potential to solve the problems it has created, it gives birth to a permanently restless generation with the freedom to be idealistic” (Hayden, 1972).

Just as Hayden introduces a “permanently restless generation” of radical idealists, Brock et al. noted that radical ideology “recommended sweeping change—revolution”(p. 89).

During the Democratic National Convention of 1968 the New Left’s rhetoric against the Vietnam War led to violent actions and confrontations. These powerful events were the results of the frustration of seeing little progress in ending the war or changing cultural and political inequalities in America (Chesebro, 1972, p. 39). Chesebro wrote, “Members of the New Left began to believe that the new circumstances created by these events required that the effectiveness and practicality of conventional protest methods be re-examined” (p. 38).

Chesebro's Radical Revolutionary Rhetorical Strategies

Griffin (1964) noted that the rhetorical beginnings of the radical New Left movement in America in the 1960's began as an "anti-movement" (Griffin, 1964). A combination of disparate groups from the growing peace and civil rights movements in America predicted, "utopian society envisioned by democratic, socialist humanists cannot be achieved except in a world at peace" (p. 10). To do this the radical elements in this new movement had to reject the present "scene" (Burke, 1952) and progressively radicalize in thought and action. Griffin continues that the New Left in 1964 needed "an expansion of its press, the broadening of its publics, the augmentation of its channels of propagation" (p. 17). In Griffin's eyes, the New Left needed more radicalism.

Chesebro (1972) in recounting the historic happenings of 1968 at the Democratic National Convention of that year in Chicago noted "the public became overtly and profoundly aware of the activities of the New Left" (p.1). Chesebro identified "five major strategic categories" of revolutionaries: political revolutionary, cultural, urban guerilla, political anarchist, and superstar (p. 4). Chesebro's five strategic categories will be fully explained in chapter three.

Dorhn quoted in *Counterculture and Revolution* (1972) "People are forming new families...units of people that trust each other both to live together and organize and fight together"(p 85). Chesebro, in a 1973 *Today's Speech* article explained "Radicals, as early as Marx, have persistently argued that privacy and self reliance reduce communication, minimize the value of the

community and the worth of a social identity, and produce alienation.

Community identity, such as that often described in Women's Liberation groups, replaces the concept of self reliance" (Chesebro, 1973). This community was identified with a counter culture movement (Roszak, 1969) and a generation (Howe, Strauss, 1991). Chesebro (1972) defined specific characteristics of the New Left, and the counter culture's rhetorical strategies that identified their intertwined radical groups.

In the next chapter the method for delineating radical Boomer Facebook profiles are described using Brock et al. (2005) to identify radical political ideology. Then the rhetorical strategies of particular radical revolutionaries will be compared to the radical Baby Boomer profiles by using Chesebro (1972).

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter looks at the primary methods of rhetorical analysis used in this thesis, first with a review of critical methods, followed by a short survey of Kenneth Burke's *Language as Symbolic Action* (1966). Then comes an overview of the main source material for ideological identification, *Making Sense of Political Ideology: The Power of Language in Democracy* (Brock, et al, 2005). From Brock, et al, five separate Facebook elements are identified that reflect radical content on selected Boomer Facebook profiles. Boomer profiles are then compared to political positions and rhetorical style of Baby Boomer radicals as young adults in the 1960's and 1970's using Chesebro's (1972) radical revolutionary strategies. Boomer profiles will then be separated by ages into two categories, *originals* (Born from 1946 to 1952), and *late comers* (Born from 1953 to 1964). Finally, some of the methodological issues involved in the analysis of the political positions of elderly Baby Boomers are identified, along with a summary of the objectives of the methodology.

A Critical Study and Symbolic Action

There are a multitude of approaches that can be taken to identify radical discourse on Baby Boomer Facebook profiles. The methodology that was chosen for this study was *criticism*. Criticism, according to Chesebro and Bertelsen

(1996) “uniquely investigates the values that humans employ”(p.184), offering alternative proposals to those values. They conclude, “Thus critics do more than state their own preferences and tastes, critics offer reasons and evidence for their claims and articulate the implications of their judgments” (p. 59). The results of this study were achieved not just from the collection of data, but also by an assessment from the cultural viewpoints and values of the critic (Ding, 2007).

The difference in studying what Boomer radicals were in the 1960’s, and studying what they advocate today in their Facebook profiles is the lack of *direct action* (Chesebro, 1972). Chesebro noted that during the 1970’s “The concept of radical political action, ...[permeated] the discourse of the counter culture (Chesebro, 1973). The radical New Left rhetoric carried with it a threat of real, not just rhetorical, action or violence (Chesebro, 1972, p. 41). Facebook is a textually based communication platform; Facebook users actions do not translate into the real world (Carney, 2010). Burke (1966) revealed “ that man is typically the symbol using animal...that refuses to realize the full extent of the role played by symbolism in his notions of reality” (p.5). Burke when speaking of action notes “actions involve character, which involves choice...action implies the ethical, the human personality”(p. 3). Boomer choices in the elements of their Facebook profiles reflect *symbolic action* (Burke, 1966) that Burke explains is an exclusively human trait:

“ The difference between a thing and a person is that the one merely *moves* whereas the other *acts*”(p.53). Heath explaining Burke’s viewpoint stated, “The internal reaction to a situation is an attitude, and the Burke, radical Boomer actions on have evolved from being tangible *offline* to the symbolic *online*. (Burke, 1966, p. 53).

A Dramatist Content Analysis System: Using Brock’s Ideological Definitions

Brock et al. (2005) ascribed their content analysis of ideological positions to the *dramatist* communication method introduced by Burke in both *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) and *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1952).

Burke is quoted as saying that “with respect to the nature of the problem solved, one tends to state the problem in such a way that his particular aptitude become the solution for it” (Brock, et al., p. 91). Political ideology then becomes the “motivation through this structure” (p. 91). Each position interprets with an “attitude toward change...” (p. 91). Each position according to Burke (1952) is looking for a resolution to the policy problem, or *catharsis* (Brock et al., p. 90). This resolution is dependent on the ideology’s reaction to *change*. Since this thesis is focused on radical ideology, Brock’s identification of radicals seeking “ dramatic change that realigns the most basic systemic character of society” (p.92) was used to identify radical Boomer profile rhetoric..

In Brock’s typology the “pentad” category corresponding with radical ideology is *agency* (Brock et al., 2005). Philosophically they also made connections with other political positions that follow Burke’s pendadic system.

Conservatism promotes the philosophy of idealism, “the faith in the power of individual reason” to solve problems (Brock et al., 2005, p. 86)

Liberalism according to Brock is aligned with materialism. Liberals describe “circumstances as the major force influencing behavior”, and “adjust policies to the situation or scene”(p.88).

Reactionary ideology, according to Brock et al. “argues to purpose or principle” (p.85). Using Burke’s (1940) pentadic philosophical connecting of “purpose” to mysticism, Brock et al. revealed reactionary ideology as “rooted in a mystically apprehended American purpose and the principle of demonstrating a will to act toward purpose (Brock et al., p.85).

With Brock et al., radical ideology was philosophically associated with pragmatism. Radicals “believe that the means of delivery or structure of any policy or process is central to its effectiveness” (p. 88). Angeles (1981) defined a pragmatist as one who believes knowledge is derived from “practical efforts” and that ideology “must relate to practice and action” (p.220). The Brock et al. delineation of radicalism from other forms of ideology was employed to select Facebook profiles that revealed radical discourse. Below is a table (See Table 3.1.) showing the various political positions, their basic philosophy and their uses of institutions and attitudes toward societal drift as explained in chapter two (p.19).

Table 3.1:

Pentadic definitions, underpinning philosophy, ideology, and reactions to societal drift

Pentad	Philosophy	Ideology and Reaction to Societal Drift
Scene	Materialism	Liberal/ extends drift by using existing societal institutions.
Agency	Pragmatism	Radical/ seeks to extend drift by replacing societal institutions with new ones.
Purpose	Mysticism	Reactionary/ seeks to reverse drift by replacing existing institutions with systems developed in the past.
Agent	Idealism	Conservative/ seeks to restrict the rate of change by using existing societal institutions.
Act	Realism	Action

Selecting the Sample

Initially 51 Facebook profiles were selected in a convenience sample for the study. The criteria for selection were as follows:

- Must have birth year from 1946-1964
- Been born in the United States
- Have a Facebook profile that self describes the individual as a political radical, and/or:
- “Like” a Facebook page or share articles from other radicals or radical organizations, and/or:
- Author notes or comment that promote extreme institutional change on their own profile or others and/or:

- Like or join radical Facebook groups and/or
- Have other radicals as Facebook friends¹

Additionally, it should be noted that profiles were selected for inclusion only if the individual had the profile privacy set at a low level so that it was open and accessible to anyone on Facebook.

After age was determined, radical political ideology was identified using the profile actions of: self-description as a radical on the information page of a profile², liking radical posts, authoring radical posts, joining radical groups, and having radical friends.

Heuristics in profile analysis

Facebook as of this writing has close to 800 million profiles; about 175 million of those are from the United States (Hodgson, 2012). With of the fluid nature of Facebook posting, and the changing formats of the platform itself, a method using heuristics to analyze and identify radical Boomer Facebook profile samples was necessary.

Angeles defines the heuristic principle as “neither asserted nor evaluated as true, but that is assumed for specific purposes at hand...because of its previous success or usefulness as an investigative tool” (Angeles, 1992. Pg.125).

¹ These actions must have one or more of the other six to be considered “radical” according to this study. Because each one of these criteria by themselves can help identify radical ideology, to come to a more certain identification, the use of at least two, and sometimes three categories provides a greater likelihood that the profile exhibits “true believer” radical ideology.

² If a Boomer identified his or her political views with collectivist or anarchic political ideology, that was considered a radical Facebook action.

Heuristic are a way to discover the answer to a problem using previous experiences, or common knowledge. Carney states that heuristics are “Essentially paradigms defined by others that a researcher then uses to qualify an observation” (Carney, 2010). In psychology, heuristics are used to more easily interpret human behavior. “A person is said to employ the availability heuristic by the ease with which instances or associations could be brought to mind” (Kahneman & Tversky. 1972). For this thesis, heuristics were used when direct information about a profile subject was overwhelming or extremely difficult to gather, given the available profile information present.

The first criterion for profile selection in this thesis was selecting Boomer profiles, those born from the years 1946 to 1964. If the profile owner did not allow the viewing of their year of birth then visual cues, images with grey hair in the profile picture, birthday wishes on the profile, available high school graduation dates, and cultural references to the 1960’s and 1970’s were used to estimate the age of the individual. If these criteria were not present, a general Internet search was made for the individual to see if the user’s age could be documented. If these data could not be found in any of the cases either on the profile or somewhere on the Internet, a subject’s profile was not included in the sample group.

The following section is an explanation of the rationale for the inclusion of individuals and groups that the Facebook profiles came from. Included are

the Facebook profile elements that were analyzed for radical intent, and examples using redacted profiles to demonstrate the criteria selection points.

Rationale For Profile Selection Groups and Criteria Examples

The first of the 51 samples of Boomer radicals chosen for this study were leaders of radical movements in the 1960's and 1970s, the New Left (Griffin, 1964). This group was first picked from literature about 1960's radicalism (Horowitz et al. 1972; Sloman, 1998) and a Wikipedia page on the Weather Underground group of the 1960's (2012, Wikipedia). These New Left radicals were then cross referenced in a Facebook search to see if the individual 1960's radicals had active Facebook pages (not just cross references to Wikipedia). Such cross-references are not active Facebook pages, but placeholders for searches. This study eliminated those, and chose only active and maintained Facebook profiles for celebrity Radicals (See Table 3.2.). All of the New Left radical profiles were analyzed not only for content, but also to identify other users that had befriended or liked their pages. These other identified friend profiles would then be analyzed for radical content for use in the study.

Table 3.2.

Criteria for choosing New Left radical Facebook profiles

New Left Radical	Radical Association	Facebook Page
B.D.	Leader of Weather Underground 1968-1972	No-Info stub only
Bob S.	Leader Black Panther party 1968	Yes
T.G.	Students for a Democratic Society	Yes
R.O.	Students for a Democratic Society	Yes
B.A	Weather Underground 1968	Yes

Groups for profile selection

As noted earlier, Radical Boomer Facebook profiles taken for this sample had low privacy levels and were completely open and accessible to anyone who was a member of Facebook. The majority of Facebook profiles were selected from pages of organizations considered *radical*, primarily concerned with extreme progressive institutional change. One of these radical groups, Occupy, was a loose organization of economic and social activists. Occupy had several Facebook groups corresponding to different cities across America where protest actions were planned. The Occupy movement swept the American cultural landscape in late 2011 by protesting and then refusing to leave a private park on Wall Street in New York City. The Occupy protesters demanded radical economic change to deal with inequality and financial hardships caused by unrestricted investing strategies in the early part of the 21st century (Walter & Woods, 2011). The group's almost two month occupation of Zuccoti park and the spreading of

“occupations” around the world in the weeks afterward led to comparisons with the 1969 occupation of “The People’s Park” in Berkley California (Paul, 2011).

Radical Boomer profiles also came from Facebook groups that advocated the institution of government administrated health care for all Americans. In 2010 President Barack Obama signed into law the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act, in effect mandating and regulating insurance coverage for every American (Noah, 2011). Several states have enacted health care reform that mandates insurance coverage, with Vermont enacting a government funded single payer system (Goodnough, 2011). Samples taken from Facebook groups that promote this type of institutional change actively promote of universal health care on their profiles.

Boomer profile samples were also taken from the American Green party. This group promotes universal health care for all Americans and promotes radical alternatives to American lifestyles and energy management (Green Party, 2010). This political party advocates changing United States electrical energy generation from “coal, oil and nuclear toward newer and cleaner sources of energy” (Brock, et al, 2005). Below is a table showing Brock’s four categories of political ideology, Burke’s pentadic foci, and their contemporary representative Facebook groups (See Table 3.3.).

Table 3.3.

Brock's Four Political Ideologies with Corresponding Burke's Pentadic Foci, and Aligned Facebook Groups (Underlined are groups radical samples were taken from).

Conservative	Reactionary	Radical	Liberal
Agent centered group	Purpose centered	Agency centered	Scene centered
Republicans Focus on Family Club for Growth	Right to Life Tea Party Libertarians	Green Party Health Care Occupy	Democrat Party Sierra Club Coffee Party
Reject and incrementally restrict Institutions	Destroy the present institutions. Return to American principles without them	Destroy present institutions replace with progressive ones	Keep present institutions. Work to extend them.

Facebook Profiles Areas for Data Collection

Facebook profiles have several information areas where data was acquired for this study. The *info* page displays information submitted by the individual such as the member's philosophy, political ideology, and their likes and dislikes. This area gives the individual an open-ended answer box to reveal political viewpoints.

The second area that data was collected from is located on the section of an individual's Facebook profile. This would reveal likes and linked articles from other radicals or radical organizations that are shared.

The *wall* area of the Facebook profile was also where the individual Facebook owner composes and posts their own notes or "status updates" that express radical institutional change.

The last areas of data collection on Facebook profiles were the individual's *friends*. Facebook friends are requested by the individual, and positively responded to by the object individual of the friendship. The list is searchable by outsiders if the individual user has opened privacy restrictions on their friends list.

Radical self-description in Boomer profiles

As pointed out in Chapter 2, Facebook profiles can be misleading due to the ability of the user to input incorrect data into the profile categories. However, a self-description of radical ideology can usually be supported by other information that can be gathered on the Facebook information page. The area on the info page where political ideology can be entered was categorized with the term *philosophy*.

One particular profile political views were classified as “Wobbly”, in reference to the nickname of the Industrial Workers of the World, an international workers union that was founded by socialists in the early 20th century (Lynd & Grubacic, 2008). This would classify the profile owner as having a “radical” profile if other supporting actions (liking and sharing radical posts, authoring radical posts, joining radical Facebook groups, and having radical friends) were present. Since however “wobbly” is such a specific reference to an avowed radical group, the reference itself carries more weight in the analysis of whether or not the profile is radical.

Another profile identifies its owner as a “Vietnam Veteran for Peace” (S.W.). This identification also does not alone qualify the profile as “radical”. However more analysis of this info page revealed “favorite quotations” came from Mao Tse Tung, the radical Marxist Chinese leader of The Republic of China from 1949-1976. These two actions together, using the heuristic, could indicate that this profile was radical. Some samples that were deemed radical had nothing in the philosophy or the “about” Facebook categories that would indicate that the user exhibited radical activity, prompting analysis of other parts of the profile to delineate radical political ideology.

Liking and sharing radical individuals, posts, and articles

On both the info page and the wall, the Facebook user has the ability to like individuals, subjects, and many other criteria that helps to identify the user as having radical content. Liking Karl Marx, or choosing him as inspiration, was considered a radical selection.

On the “wall and timeline of Facebook profiles, the user has the ability to post and share articles from other web sources and to like posts of other Facebook friends. The sharing of articles with radical content, or “liking” of other radical posts will appear on the user’s wall. Approval or reposting of articles once on a profile does not categorize the profile as radical; however, consistent liking and reposting of radical content were considered radical actions.

Writing radical posts on profiles

Authoring notes with radical content or responding in writing to posts on individual radical group profile pages were considered radical Facebook actions. Further identification of these Facebook profiles as radical depended on the consistency of postings and the rhetorical style it represented. One sample profile had no outward actions of radicalism, but had several posts of written responses on the Occupy page for their local radical group (Brenda R.). Most would post comments to other articles they had shared; some would author extended essays and post them on their Facebook wall. If postings indicated a call to action, a protest meet up or a boycott, these were indications of radical rhetorical style. We will discuss these further when dealing with Chesebro's (1972) revolutionary radical rhetorical style categorization.

Liking a radical group

This action was present in the majority of the preliminary set of profiles, including those of the original New Left radicals. Once again, the action of liking or belonging to a group did not totally delineate that a Facebook profile was considered radical. Liking a radical group could be a status enhancement tool as Lui's (2007) work on taste performances in social media platforms indicates. Kenneth Burke (1952) also speaks about *identification* in *The Rhetoric of Motives* (p.22), using the term *consubstantiality* to indicate individuals who paradoxically feel tied in some unique way to other groups. All these radical actions within Facebook are necessary for the profile to be identified as a radical profile.

Radical friends

Having radical friends was also one of the other primary actions used to find the initial sample of radical Boomers. Initially the secondary groups of Boomer Facebook profiles were selected from the Facebook friend list of original New Left radicals.

Friendship in Facebook terms does not denote actual intimacy or companionship, but can be considered as exhibiting the principle of *homophily* in social networks. The definition of homophily is compared to the old adage “birds of a feather flock together” to explain this phenomenon (McPherson, Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001, p. 2). Homophily is “the principle that a contact between similar people occurs at a higher rate than among dissimilar people”(p. 4), and that any social entity that depends to a substantial degree on networks for its transmission will tend to be localized in social space and will obey certain fundamental dynamics as it interacts with other social entities”(p. 18).

On Facebook, as in other social networks, people who follow similar subjects have tendencies to believe the tenets of the associated group. Having radical friends *with* any one of the other two particular actions, liking and sharing of posts, and authoring radical posts could, however, indicate the profile was radical.

Brock (1965) noted, “Burke’s system of rhetoric might enable the critic to draw conclusions about the strategies or rhetorical devices used by politicians or other special groups” (p.51). Brock’s system is useful for identifying a radical

but not for determining the type of action and commitment that the radical is likely to take.

To find out how New Left radical rhetoric was strategized we discuss Chesebro's (1972) *Rhetorical Strategies of the Radical Revolutionary* in which Chesebro noted "The shift from protest to resistance necessarily implies a rejection of the present, its norms, rules and heroes"(p. 39). Rejection of the present, with the acceptance of the movement of society forward corroborated Brock's delineation of radical political ideology. Chesebro (1972) continues where Brock's (1965) leaves off, in the wake of the beginnings of the political New Left as it began to distinguish itself from the Old Left by "a new spirit of radicalism" (Griffin, 1964). As Baby Boomer radicals became more frustrated with institutional inequities and American militarism, their frustrations led them to mobilize actions that were more effective than traditional protest: "The number of militants grew rapidly and began to dominate the movement in word (the rhetoric of confrontation) and deed (guerrilla actions)"(Chesebro, 1972, p. 38). Chesebro identified five rhetorical strategies used by these militants in their speech to rationalize their actions. The next section of this chapter explains Chesebro's (1972) five strategies, and explains how they were used to identify the rhetorical strategies used by Boomer radicals on Facebook profiles.

Using Chesebro's "Radical Revolutionary" Rhetoric Analysis

Chesebro's (1972) research in the rhetoric of the 1960's revolutionary radical categorized the rhetorical strategies, both verbal and non-verbal of the

New Left of the 1960's. Below is a table that outlines these strategies, sample rhetoric from that era, and the intended goals of the individual groups (See Table 3.4.).

Table 3.4.

Chesebro's Rhetorical Strategies, Samples, and Goals

Strategies	Sample Radical Rhetoric	Goals
Political Revolutionary	We have to force our own definitions on these creeps ... force them to start dealing with us on our own terms. (Sinclair. 1971)	Build and replace power
Cultural Revolutionary	The end of the sex role ... the patriarchy and the male supremacist ethic. (Millett. 1970)	Internal culture change
Urban Guerilla	This is Bernardine Dohrn I'm going to read A DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR. (Dohrn.1970)	Violence induced change
Anarchist	Private property and puritan morality...become obsolete concepts. (Hayden. 1969)	Independent governance
Superstar	Inside the bowels of the monster born in Bethel also lay the kernel for its destruction. (Hoffman. 1971)	Dramatize the conflict

Identifying the term *revolutionary* as a god term, Chesebro noted that at the time, each group of radical revolutionaries used different rhetorical strategies to achieve their goals against their institutional enemies (p. 3). We will now explain each of these strategies and then show a sample of the rhetorical categories found in this study.

Political revolutionary

According to Chesebro, the political revolutionary wants to strike at the head of an organization to degrade or destroy the institution. Political revolutionary radicals demand “change in the management” (p. 41) of institutions and political policy. This style of revolutionary radical knows that power comes from the top in these types of organizations, and will try to overwhelm the leaders of that organization with a show of force: “to produce a display of power that forces a change in policy management”(p. 41). Examples of this type of radical content in the Boomer Facebook samples included comments of Boomers organizing demonstrations for the Occupy movement on their Facebook profiles, “Next steps decided at Occupy Koch Town, Wichita Kansas, Feb 17...Occupy Monsanto” (Janice B.), said one profile. Another referred to a planned protest at the 2012 Super Bowl, “ACTION ALERT: two superbowl (sic) actions planned...see the minutes from Saturday’s ga for details and to become involved” (Brian T.). In Chesebro’s typology, the political radical is an organizer of various coalitions to evoke a change in the hierarchy of an institution. Facebook profiles that show political revolutionary radical rhetoric are participating in strategic organizing of protests on these profiles.

Cultural revolutionary radical

Chesebro noted that radical cultural revolutionary movements, such as the feminist, gay, and communal family movement represent the “most popular group currently emerging” (p. 42). Cultural revolutionaries deal with what goes

on in their lives every day (p. 42). The cultural revolutionary radical rejects the cultural norms that are present, and tries to destroy and limit them, ultimately replacing them with new and more progressive cultural environments.

An example of cultural revolutionary rhetoric is a Boomer profile that identified with radical environmental issues stating that “Obama has his head up the massive energy industry’s ass” (Craig S.) with a link to an article about the arrest of an environmentalist filmmaker in a congressional hearing. Below that post was a “like” from one of the poster’s friends (H.M.). Cultural revolutionary radicals are interested in influencing the groups that they personally identify with. Whether it is environmental issues or animal rights petitions, these individual profiles reflect radical content that appeals to others with the same interests. Cultural revolutionary radicals group together for a larger cause they feel connected to, within their particular cultural group.

Urban guerilla

Urban guerillas were interested in literally destroying “sources and symbols of power” (Chesebro, 1972, p. 42). Urban guerillas engaged in violent activities, bombing, kidnapping and robbery to achieve institutional and hierarchical change (p. 43). Facebook prohibits this type of violent radical rhetoric by having strict policies against advocating violence in profiles. No instances of urban guerillas were found. The sustained use of this type of rhetoric can result in an individual being banned from Facebook. New Left radicals that were noted in the past as urban guerillas did not exhibit any self-

made violent imagery or rhetoric on their profiles. However, in one instance a post from another Facebook user appeared on a celebrity radical's profile referring to Guy Fawkes Day, an anarchist holiday resulting from England's fifteenth century "Gunpowder Plot" attempt to blow up the English Parliament. "Remember, remember, the fifth of November. Gunpowder, Treason, and plot. I see no reason why gunpowder, treason Should ever be forgot³..."(Bill A.).

It is improbable that Boomer urban guerrilla revolutionary radicals could consistently promote their style of radicalism on Facebook. The platform's administrative self-policing and complaints from other Facebook users against violent or offensive rhetoric would prevent them from acting in this manner.

Political anarchist

Chesebro (1972) writes, "For political anarchists, anarchy is an ideological world view espousing a political and social system ordered by decentralized, individualist community cooperation...anarchism is not coercive in principle, but seeks to see a people free of governmental, parental, bureaucratic and financial controls" (p. 6). The anarchist believes that individuals can make decisions that will loosely guide a group into "harmony"(p. 6). Chesebro notes anarchism does not approve of cadre-formation. Anarchist radicals are not prone to build coalitions due to their rejection of power blocks. The exception to that rule is that anarchists seem to identify with other groups of anarchists (p. 7). In one Boomer Facebook profile this was expressed in

³ A song commemorating November the 5th, Guy Fawkes Day in Britain. (Hutton.2001)

quotations from a labor movement song, “Ain't no doubt about it, ain't nobody free, until all are free and the state can no longer be” (A.J.M.).

Superstar

“The essential function of superstars—seriously adopting the metaphor of the theatre—is to produce a dramatic act which characterizes the struggle between the establishment and movement people”(Chesebro, 1972, p. 7). In Boomer’s Facebook profiles, various radical posts and notes were visible but none pointed to a dramatic act that would make a lasting impression. Several posts included dramatic language: “Join Occupy and begin to see why American patriots are risking their lives” (S.H.), said one. “THIS IS REALLY IMPORTANT AND REALLY SCAREY” (Susan H.), said another. These statements rhetorically expressed drama, however they did not point to any act that would have made an impression, or move institutions to change.

Subdivision of Boomers by Age

After initial selection of the radical Boomer profiles, and the categorization of their rhetorical characteristics according to Chesebro (1972), the Boomers sample was subdivided again by age in order to detect any rhetorical difference between the older and the younger Boomer radicals. The profiles were divided into two categories: Originals, born from 1946-1952 and Late Bloomers, born from 1953-1964.

These categories were selected to correspond with older Boomers that were in college or above the age of 18 during the most politically chaotic parts of

the 1960's in the United States (Hinckle & Zion, 1971. p. 8). The older cohort's profiles were then compared with profiles from younger Boomer radicals, checking for differences in radical Facebook profile actions and revolutionary radical rhetorical style.

Chapter Conclusion

The methodology described above did three things:

1. Delineated and defined Baby Boomer radical Facebook profiles using Brock et al. (2005).
2. Subdivided those Boomer radical profiles into True Believer Originals and Late Comers by age.
3. Identified the rhetoric found in these profiles according to Chesebro's 1972 *Rhetorical Styles of the Revolutionary Radical*.

The use of Facebook profiles to measure political content or activity is not new (Pew. 2009-2011). Many marketing and political studies have used the information found in Facebook profiles (Pew, 2010). Facebook is also the largest of the social networks, and has the richest amount of self-identified data (NYT Topics, 2012). Because of Facebook's categorizations on the profile information page it is possible to access personal information and preferences, and to analyze *liking* and *friending* on the users wall or timeline of the individual. In the next chapter we will look at the results of the study and will use them to answer the research questions.

Chapter 4: Boomer Profile Analysis

In this chapter, three research questions posed in chapter 1 are recalled, the criteria used to answer the questions are reviewed, and the questions answered. The research questions are:

RQ1: What are radical Baby Boomer's major ways of expressing radicalism on their Facebook profiles? This question is answered by analyzing collected Facebook criteria to define a profile as *radical* as stated in chapter 3. First noted is Boomer Facebook profile data delineating Boomer age range, next the Facebook group location the profile was taken from, and finally the profile actions taken by the Facebook user to espouse radical content (See Appendix 4.1).

RQ2: What is the predominant rhetorical style of radical ideology in radical Boomer Facebook profiles? This is answered by analyzing the Boomer profiles for their rhetorical style using Chesebro's (1972) framework. The five categories of radical revolutionaries from the 1960's are separated by looking at the types of rhetorical strategies that led the Boomer individual groups to direct actions; political, cultural, urban guerilla, anarchist and superstar (pp. 41-45).

RQ3: Are there differences in expression and rhetorical style of older ‘Original’ Boomer Radicals compared to younger ‘Late Bloomer’ radical Boomers? This question is answered by categorizing the Boomer sample as either “Original” Boomers, those born between 1946 and 1952, or “Late Comers”, born between 1953 and 1964. The difference between the two Boomer age cohorts to be used in the sample Facebook profiles is then compared.

RQ1: “What are radical Baby Boomer’s major ways of expressing radicalism on their Facebook profiles?”

In the 1960’s, many radical Boomers were inspired to action from a rhetorical base of speeches, publications, manifestoes and print culture (McMillin 2009). Violent actions such as bombings and kidnapping’s radical Boomers engaged in were also considered rhetorical devices to send a message to the establishment (Chesebro, 1972). The violent imagery in terms such as “tear this mother down” and “counterculture war” that appeared in Boomer radical speech of the 1960’s was meant to evoke or threaten direct, violent action to change institutions and policy.

Radical Boomers on Facebook seem to have undergone a transformation in their commitment to direct action. Gone is the radical Boomer call for violent overthrow and chaos caused by massive protest actions. Boomer radicals in this study overwhelmingly joined and posted in radical Facebook groups as their major ways of expressing radicalism in their Facebook profiles (See Appendix 4.1).

The entire Boomer sample group was a member of one or more radical Facebook groups. All of the Boomers in the sample also liked or shared posts in radical Facebook groups. Even radical profiles that were not selected by group membership for the study, but from celebrity or other radical Facebook friend connections, had interactions with Facebook groups exhibiting radical ideology. This attraction of like-minded individuals in social network grouping is known as “homophily” (McPherson, Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001) and revolves around a shared relationship or interest. The ties can be weak or very strong, almost familial. Some of the sample Boomer profiles exhibiting homophily promoted and shared posts in only one or two particular radical Facebook groups. Others in the sample would share links, and post comments in many Facebook groups with similar radical themes. Many of the Boomers posted in Occupy groups around the world, and did not seem to have a particular home group to which they posted regularly. Still it was clear that being a member of a radical group with similar ideology was an important action on Facebook profiles for Boomer radicals. Moreover, the Facebook entries of these radical Boomers suggest that an expressed radical self-definition remains important, and that interacting with a rich variety of other radicals seem to be an important to the selected radical Boomers.

The two radicals defined as anarchists, who by definition reject hierarchal groups, also identified with groups on their profiles. Boomer anarchists did have weaker ties to groups and their profile comments indicated an independence

from, or distrust of, groups in general.

Donath and boyd (2004) point out “a public display of connection is implicit verification of identity.” (p. 73) Each one of the identified profiles overtly connected in some way to radical content. Boomers stayed within their radical cultural groups indicating the audience for the posts had the same interests as the Boomer profile owner.

Some Boomer profiles used their identification with radical groups as “taste performance” (Liu, 2007). Those few tried to gain credibility with a radical audience by noting their resume of stereotypical radical beliefs and training. Quotes from Ghandi, political training classes and previous employment with political organizations gave the orderliness of a professional while stressing radical “leadership” (Ron V.). Their profiles seemed to be organized in such a way as to make impressions on others rather than espouse a cultural or political statement of their own personal ideology (Schenkler, 1980).

The least employed profile action category of the Boomer sample was self-description, proclaiming oneself as a radical. This could be a function of maturity. Braungart and Braungart (1990) noted in their interviews with former SDS radicals 20 years later that “ though they held the same views, they were less radical, less militant, more willing to work within the system and to compromise” (p. 34).

The more active political revolutionaries also moderated their own political self-descriptions, not directly admitting they were radical, but instead

used tempered descriptions such as “progressive democrat” (Bill H.), and similarly vague platitudes, “ I believe what is best for the least among us is good for America and the world” (Rick S.). For the political revolutionaries, the building of power bases among disparate groups is their number one goal (Chesebro, 1972, p. 41), so using language that did not alienate individuals, yet stressed commitment to radical causes fits their needs.

As was noted earlier, the actions of 1960’s revolutionaries stemmed from a radical rhetorical base. Particular words and rhetorical styles motivated disparate groups to act individually or as a whole when demonstrating counter culture power (p.41). Now, somewhat in reverse, Facebook actions in a virtual space revealed the rhetorical styles of radical Boomers. Just as the rhetoric of the New Left inspired movement solidarity, Boomer radicals on Facebook used the actions of liking, sharing, and posting to bind their virtual cultural communities together, and for some to build bases of power between radical cultural groups on Facebook for calls to action outside of the virtual world.

RQ2: “What is the predominant rhetorical style of radical ideology in radical Boomer Facebook profiles?”

Using Chesebro’s (1972) analysis of radical rhetorical strategies of the New Left as a guide, this guide found that a majority of the radical profiles used cultural political revolutionary rhetoric. There were no calls to a specific action such as a protest march or for Facebook users to go to a specific website to join a movement. Cultural revolutionary radicals posted, wrote, and liked things that

interested their cultural grouping on Facebook. They liked the posts of others in their cultural group, and friended those that held their cultural views.

Cultural revolutionary radicals

The predominance of cultural revolutionary radicals in the sample confirmed that Boomer radicals first of all saw themselves as a counterculture, as opposed to just a political force. This cultural connection stemmed from “friendship and mutual admiration” (McMillan, 2009). Boomer radicals in later life have been found to have primary social relationships with spouses and friends whose outlooks aligned with the radical’s political ideology (Baungart & Baungart, 1990). This American counter culture was birthed by radical political ideology, and radical Boomers looked for that ideology in their friend associations on Facebook.

Few radical Boomer profiles mixed personal with radical ideological promotion, using their Facebook pages mainly for promotion of radical activism. Most personal interchanges consisted of conversations with individuals liking a post, or someone with whom they had regular interactions on other Facebook groups. Personalized posts or messages usually had reference to an individual’s family and cultural change promotion of the radical lifestyle. If relatives were spoken about in any way, it was usually in a context of “making the world a better place” for them or highlighting something a relative did that agreed with a radical stance.

In short, most Boomer radicals in this group promoted radicalism in their Facebook profiles in a less homogenous way, preferring to share with their own group or radical subset on Facebook. Those that tried to build coalitions in their profiles did so to entice other Facebook radicals to activities outside of Facebook that helped build a broad base of radical political power.

Political revolutionary radicals

Chesebro has defined the “political revolutionary radical” as one who uses rhetoric to “strategically ...produce a display of power that forces a change in policy management, essentially a strategy based on the threat of violence” (p. 40) Overt threats of violence on Facebook are against the social network’s user policies, and can result in having a profile removed. What Facebook does have is the perception of connectivity to a massive membership pool (Hogsdon, 2012), the use of technology to gather people at a moment’s notice, and the ability to immediately document the action for media dissemination (van de Donk, Walgrave & Wright, 2004).

Boomer political revolutionary radicals from the group tried to build Facebook coalitions in order to produce actions outside of the realm of Facebook. Boomer radical profiles were considered to have political revolutionary radical content due to the profile owner posting calls to specific action: Posting meeting times for protest, advertising information meetings to join radical groups, making phone calls, or promotion of a website outside of Facebook to encourage others in joining a radical organization or donate money. Political revolutionary

radical Boomers from the sample documented Occupy protests they had attended, and promoted future actions of Occupy groups. Several posted photos of recent protest actions. One posted a video of an Occupy protest action outside of a major sporting event.

Ten of the Boomer radical profiles were determined to have political revolutionary radical rhetoric. Of those, three were professional activists were paid by various radical organizations to represent them. Although radical in rhetorical content, these profiles showed much more thought about esthetics, using the new timeline format that Facebook introduced in December, 2011. Being paid political activists is not a new phenomenon for Boomers. Many radical Boomers went on from their heydays of the 1960s into organizing positions with political organizations (Baungart & Baungart. 1990). Boomers profiles of professional political operatives had particular agendas, many to promote their parent organization. But these political revolutionary radicals still maintained a wide range of radical content on their Facebook profiles to appeal to a wide group of radical interests. These three professionals kept their information page as more of a resume of education and administration than a documentation of radicalism.

One professional (Ron V.) quoted speeches from famous progressives (JFK, Robert Kennedy, and Gandhi) in his favorite quotations. In his profile he identified himself as a “powerful, passionate committed, unreasonable leader.” In comparison, nonprofessional Boomers with political revolutionary radical

content on their Facebook profiles were mostly concerned with a single cause, in particular the Occupy movement. Janice B. had privacy locks on her personal information page, but an open Facebook “wall” that advertised coming meetings of Occupy in her area with encouragement to come out for these events.

Noticeably, unlike the professionals who seemed to want to show solidarity with many radical causes, the non-professional political revolutionary individuals had few radical posts unrelated to their primary radical Facebook outreach, and generally stayed on message about the primary focus of their radical ideology.

Anarchist revolutionary radicals

Two radical profiles were considered to have political anarchist content, both coming from Occupy movement groups. Anarchist radical Boomer profiles espoused the need for a de-centralized government that is primarily pure Marxist. Also these profiles displayed a distrust of all political groups in general.

One of the two anarchist revolutionary profiles declared his motto to be “de Omnibus Dubitandum”, Latin for “be suspicious of everything” (Descartes, 1641). The other anarchist’s profile added passages to an old socialist union work song under their favorite quotations, “Ain’t no doubt about it, ain’t nobody free, until all are free and the state no longer be” (A.J.M).

Superstar revolutionary radicals

Even though there were radical superstars from the 1960’s and 1970’s among the sample group there was no standout dramatic act or personality that

could move culture and institutions. Facebook has standardized themes for profiles, so essentially one profile looks like another. There was no dramatic rhetoric or video documented on these samples that could be classified as “superstar” criteria.

Abbie Hoffman, a radical organizer from New York was made famous as a defendant in the trial of the Chicago Seven⁴, setting the standard for radical superstar in the 1970’s. Fellow activist Art Goldberg called him a “media celebrity” (Sloman, 1998). Known for organizing dramatic events such as burning money at the New York Stock exchange, and attempting to levitate the Pentagon in Washington D.C., these radicals used theater to dramatize in unconventional ways concerns about capitalism and war.

This type of dramatizing for radical effect is usually done on Facebook by sharing and forwarding links and videos. However, there is no one galvanizing personality that is responsible, or one major dramatic act to promote this ideology. Facebook is a huge community, and within the community, superstar radicals have extreme competition for radical content from many sources. The sample Boomers from Facebook, including those that had been “superstars” in the past, did not exhibit superstar radical content on their Facebook profiles.

⁴ The trial of the Chicago Seven included Hoffman, fellow activists Jerry Rubin, David Dellenger, Tom Hayden, Rennie Davies, John Friones, Lee Wiener, and Bobby Seale. Seale was tried separately. All were arrested for violating a 1968 federal anti-riot law for their part in organizing protests at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. (Linder. 2008. <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/chicago7>)

RQ3: Are there differences in expression and rhetorical style of older “Original” Boomer Radicals compared to younger “Late Bloomer” radical Boomers?

This question sought to find possible radical Boomer differences in Facebook profile actions and rhetorical strategies by dividing their generation into two age cohorts. Radical Boomer profiles were divided into two groups, *original* radical Boomers (born 1946-1952) and *late comers* (born 1953-1964) (See Appendix 4.2).

Originals and late comer Boomer Radicals revealed almost no difference in their choices of Facebook profile actions. Each cohort liked and shared posts. There was little difference between the two groups when comparing the amount of younger versus older Boomers that wrote some kind of posts themselves. Both Boomer groups had radical friends and all Boomers belonged to radical groups.

One noticeable difference did emerge however: more late bloomers than originals self-identified as political radicals, despite the inclusion of some original radicals of the 1960’s New Left. Each cohort group had one anarchist, and only small amount of original Boomer’s were active political revolutionaries compared to the late bloomers. In the next chapter we reveal the major study conclusions, look at the study limitations, and have suggestions for further research.

Chapter 5: Thesis Conclusions, Study Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

In this chapter major conclusions from the research are first discussed followed by a review of study limitations along with final recommendations for further research on the subject.

Conclusions

Radical Boomers, who once took to the streets with violent demonstrations, now have turned to rhetorical political action in the community of Facebook. They have gone from activism in reality to symbolic action in the virtual world. Today Baby Boomer radicals reveal their various radical ideologies by liking and sharing Facebook posts and articles. Though consistent and active in the radical virtual community, Boomer radicals on Facebook have by and large turned inward, rarely expressing radicalism in the offline world by participation in large-scale actions and protest marches. With *tokens* of liking and sharing Boomer radicals Facebook profiles promoted cultural lifestyles and causes divided along the lines of, ethnicity, sexual preference, environmentalism, feminism, animal rights, and economic equality for all. These postings seem intended for internal consumption by an audience made up of their own cultural peer group. There seems little difference in posting of radical content between

older (originals) and younger (late comers) Boomers. The younger, late comer age cohort seemed more ready to self- identify themselves as radical, possibly the result of *identification* (Burke, 1955) with the older, more visibly radical cohort. Burke uses the term *consubstantiality*, when presenting his system for identification. According to Burke those that want to identify do so to “confront the implications of division” (Burke, 1955, p. 22). Though all other radical criteria were met, self-identifying as a radical seemed to lend the cachet of *radicalism* to the profile (Lui 2007). Lui points out that “one does not fully exist online until one writes oneself into being” (p.1). However, identification with past times that late comers did not participate in seems to mute Boomer radical rhetoric on Facebook.

This thesis notes that known celebrity radicals from the 1960’s lacked dramatic calls to action on their Facebook profiles. These former New Left radicals, the superstars of their era, were muted in their rhetoric on Facebook. New Left radicals instead allow other, younger generation radicals to post radical rhetoric, then liking or sharing that material. Some of the New Left that uses Facebook does so as promotional tools for their economic and reputation enhancement. The black and white news photos of 1960’s radicals in leather jackets and boots have been replaced with handsome professional looking profile pictures in business attire.

Networking on the Internet today is primarily a marketplace of ideas or services (Chesebro, 2003). Facebook, a platform that is financed by placing

customized advertising on each users profile, seems antithetical to the type of communication system the New Left envisioned that would transform culture (Barbrook, 1999). Facebook is the type of top down; capitalistic system that the New Left fought against in its heyday (Sloman, 1998).

However, Facebook, has been instrumental in making political ideological thought transparent, a former goal of the New Left, and has recently helped bring down some corrupt governments (Vargas, 2011). Radical thought defined by Brock et al. (2005) is not concerned with outcomes (purpose) but with attitude toward institutions (agency). It is ironic that the participatory democracy that the radical New Left was after (Chesebro, 1972, p.38) would be spread by a closed, consumption based technology platform (Chesebro, 2003).

Although Facebook has evolved into an expressive representation of real life it is still just a place for rhetoric. Radical rhetoric is still just that, rhetorical unless actuated.

Hilderbrand (2006) speaks of cultural memory as an “ affective history compromising (inter) personal pleasures and experiences that are often mediated” (p.306). Boomers realize they are part of a special and fairly large group. This group shares experiences and time frames. Radical Boomers also share specific memories with peers, ideological events being the core of their remembrance. For Boomer radicals in the 1960’s and 1970’s, actions were the ultimate expression of their radicalism.

On Facebook the Boomer radical can still perform actions, whether posting self-authored notes, or sharing a video of a protest. However this constitutes all of what a Boomer radical can do in a Facebook profile. The majority of the profiles in this study were not political revolutionary radicals trying to elicit actions outside of Facebook, but were mostly cultural revolutionary radicals who shared posts with their cultural peer group on matters related to their particular radical interests.

New Left radical Abbie Hoffman stated that 1960's rock music icons purporting to support the New Left agenda "desecrated and defiled the symbols of Amerika (sic) because (they) abhorred its basic corruptness—a feeling difficult to maintain on fifty-thousand dollar a night performances" (Horowitz, 1971). Communication on Facebook requires the economic means to have the technology at your disposal. With that individual economic ability it can be somewhat hypocritical to promote radical ideology accusing American economic policy of being corrupt. Few original New Left Boomer radicals directly addressed major economic situations on Facebook, or even commented about universal health care, something that the leading edge of the Boom are dealing with now that they have turned 65.

Equally as informative in this study is what Baby Boomer radicals aren't doing on Facebook. Facebook has successfully fomented revolution around the world (Vargas, 2011) by connecting individuals into ideological communities for actions offline. But for Boomer radicals, large numbers gathered on Facebook

have not shut down a university. Liking a radical post from a fellow radical has not taken over a government office. Forwarding a petition to all a person's Facebook friends was not the same as throwing blood on executives and burning money at a stock exchange. Most Boomer radicals online seemed to only like, share, and comment on these recent events, with little or no evidence of similar offline activity.

Research Limitations

One of the problems faced in this study was the design of the Facebook platform. Facebook is a self-contained system of databases that house billions of details on almost a billion individuals. To view profile data however, an individual must be registered member of Facebook. Even after becoming a Facebook member, public viewing of data on another's profile is controlled by that user through their profile privacy settings. Lack of access to non-profile data is the first limitation to this study. Most of the profiles from the sample had few or very low privacy settings, which allowed access to information relevant to this thesis. Still, at times was difficult to isolate group activity.

During the middle of December 2012, while data was being collected for this thesis, Facebook introduced a timeline for its wall and info pages (Wortham, 2012). This timeline put certain information on Facebook in an archive-like state, prohibiting a review of each posted event on a Facebook profile. This feature limited data collection. It was a hindrance to longitudinal research and also rearranged or closed off some data. Research had to be supplemented by other

places on the web for those profiles that lacked access due to the adoption of the new design.

Facebook data from Baby Boomers is at most six years old, starting from the date that Facebook opened up membership to those outside of college networks. This data timeline is comparatively short, thus limiting a more complete picture of an individual's Facebook activity over time. As more data is input on Facebook profiles, clearer pictures of political ideology can emerge from Facebook profiles.

The lack of posted birth dates and high school graduation years on the information pages was another limitation to this study. Baby Boomers are a defined generation with birth years from 1942 to 1964. Information about the age of the individual was not always readily available on Facebook profiles or on other locations on the internet.

During research it was discovered that the majority of the 1960's New Left radicals picked for the study were not in fact Boomers. These original radicals were born, in some cases, seven years earlier than the first Baby Boomer. After continued reading of Strauss and Howe's (1991) generation study it was decided that those celebrity radicals within two years of the Boomer birth years would be retained. Strauss and Howe stressed, "they are there [part of a generation] whether they want to be or not" (p. 68). The lack of the New Left founders archetypal radical (Chesebro, 1973) in the sample was a limitation of this study. .

Heuristics are deduced by previous experiences, a rationalization of data using the past to make judgments about present information (Kahneman & Tversky, 1972). Heuristics are the perfect analytical tool to use in a study based on analysis of short messages and Facebook *likes*. A critical study of social interactions finds that “people have intentions, not all of which are directly stated” (Taylor, 1982). Heuristics were used to make inferences that are critical at times to this thesis, due to the lack of complete profile information. This limits the forming of operational definitions of true political ideological identity.

All of the Facebook profile information is user provided with no confirmation by outside sources. That could make Facebook information incorrect, embellished, or outright falsehoods. It is possible some Facebook users identify with a radical cause or group from a desire to perform, to be accepted among peers and to gain identity. Turkle (1998) notes that a virtual life can carry with it a “moment of invention” (p. 38), where the transition from our offline lives to virtual ones can make us open up our true selves or dramatize certain life situations. Radical embellishment could be to identify with a movement that might have passed them by because of age or circumstance (Riggs, 2009).

According to Brock et al., rhetoric can reveal political ideological identification (Brock, et al, 2005). Within the profiles however, rhetoric was usually an abbreviated form. The rhetoric from these profiles consisted in mostly liking and sharing someone else’s radical rhetoric. User-generated

content could only be short sentences and notes. These short, eclectic, stream of consciousness notes were difficult to analyze for radical rhetorical activity, and presented another limitation of this thesis.

Because of time constraints, a convenience sample was used. The sample identified by connections to other radicals and to radical groups. Only certain criteria locations on Facebook profiles were reviewed. The limited number of Boomer profiles reviewed also constrained this study.

Recommendations for Future Study

The mainstream of the Boomer generation was defined in the 1960's by a few political ideologues. To look at how these aging idealists interact in the virtual world is important to the field of communications and technology mediated interactions.

Future study can include face-to-face interviews with Boomer radicals to assess what style of rhetoric they feel they have adopted on Facebook. A more longitudinal study of radical Boomer Facebook content, with a complete review of the individual Facebook profile from the day the user began on the platform, could see the evolution of rhetoric more plainly. In-depth reviews of radical Boomers on Facebook would include other online postings in radical leaning blogs and other websites.

A comparison of Boomer radicals on Facebook to Millennial Generation users is also an important future study. Millennials still make up the core of

Facebook users, and in some cases were the enablers of Boomer entry onto the social media platform.

Facebook's origins were primarily textual, and the service is still based around word descriptions and long form text. However as seen in study limitations, many of these rhetorical devices are not long form treatises but mainly assent to other forms of rhetoric, such as liking another's status or post. Future study can help create critical paradigms to evaluate these short sentences and digital actions for rhetorical motives. New critical tools to judge images, videos, and other Facebook activities can be developed and used to study the development of individual lives on a virtual network.

This study viewed this insular Boomer group, 1960's radicals, but future study can look at the perception of these radical Boomers from Facebook users around the world. Future study can see also if support for radical causes in America has affected Facebook worldwide, such as Facebook's previously mentioned involvement in the "Arab Spring" revolutions of 2011 (Vargas, 2011).

Recent theories segmenting Boomers into cohorts by life experiences, not the years they were born (Pontell, 2009) can lead to other, non-generational studies of cohort attitudes in particular geographic locations and during different historical events. This type of study can further isolate political ideology and its expression on Facebook.

A study of Boomers, radical or otherwise must at some time touch on the subject of gerontology, and how the aging access and use communication

technology. Many of these radical Boomers had backgrounds in communications and rhetoric studies (Sloman, 1998). Future study can include how aging Boomers, accustomed to eloquent discourse, deal with abbreviated forms found in many social forums such as Facebook.

Finally, as new politically centered social networks are introduced these new platforms can be studied to see if there is a difference in Boomer ideology within different social platforms. Building on this thesis in other social networks with other political ideologies can help build new communication paradigms for rhetorical research.

Works Cited

- Angeles, P. (1981). *Harper Collins Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York, NY: Harper Collins
- Back, M., Egloff, B., Gaddis, S., Gosling, S. J., Schmukle, S., Stopfer, J., & Vazire, S. (2009). Facebook profiles reflect actual personality not self-idealization. *Psychological Science*, 2010, 21
- Barbrook, R. (2001). Cyber-Communism: How the Americans are superseding capitalism in cyberspace. *Imaginary Futures*. Retrieved from <http://www.imaginaryfutures.net>
- Braungart, M., & Braungart, R. (1990). The life course development of left and right wing youth activist leaders from the 1960's. *Political Psychology*, 11(2)
- Biocca, F., Burgoon, J., Harms, C., Stoner, M. (2001). Criteria and scope conditions for a theory and measure of social presence. *Presence 2001*. Philadelphia
- Boaz, D. (1986). *Left, right & baby boom: America's new politics*. Washington, DC. Cato Institute
- boyd, d., & Donath, J. (2004). Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal*, 22(4)
- Brock, B. (1965). *A Definition of Four Political Positions and a Description of their Rhetorical Characteristics*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University

- Brock, B. Howell, S., Huglen, M., Klumpp, J. (2005). *Making sense of political ideology: The power of language in democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Burke, K. (1955). *Rhetoric of motives*. New York, NY: George Braziller Publishers
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of motives*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press
- Carney, R. (2010). *Defining and exploring virtual reality: A Burkeian and heuristic analysis* (Master's thesis). Available from <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries>
- Carr, D. (2008). How Obama tapped into social networks' power. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Chesebro, J. W. (1971). Rhetorical strategies of the radical revolutionary. *Today's Speech*, Winter 1972
- Chesebro, J. W. (2003). Imagination, virtual reality, and digital communication systems: constructing a new sensory system for human beings. Retrieved from <http://www.jameswchesebro.com/2003/08/imagination-virtual-reality-and-digital-communication-systems-constructing-a-new-sensory-system-for-human-beings-2/>
- Chesebro, J. W. (2002). *The Internet and the concept of audience*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico

- Chesebro, J. W. (2000) .Communication technologies as symbolic form: cognitive transformations generated by the internet. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, Winter 2000
- Chesebro, J.W., Bertelsen, D. (1996). *Analyzing media: Communication technologies as symbolic and cognitive systems*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press
- Cook,J., McPhersonM., & Smith-Lovin,L.(2001). Birds of a feather: Homophilly in social networks. *The Annual Review of Sociology* (27) 415-44
- Dwyer, J. (2010). Four nerds and a cry to arms against Facebook. *The New York Times*. Retrieved at <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Gates, A. (2009). For Baby Boomers, the joys of Facebook. *The New York Times* . Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Gitlin, T.(1980). *The whole world is watching*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press
- Goffman,E, (1964). *Behavior in public places*. Chicago, IL: Free Press of Glencoe
- Goffman,E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY : Doubleday
- Goodnough, A. (2011). Vermont governor signs health care law. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Green Party Platform. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.gp.org/>
- Griffin, L. (1964). The rhetorical structure of the 'New Left' movement: Part I. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, L (2)

- Helft, M. (2010). Facebook makes headway around the world. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Hilderbrand, L. (2006). Retroactivism. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 12 (2)
- Hinkle, W. (1971). Guerrilla acts of sabotage and terrorism in the U.S. 1965-1970. *Scanlan's Monthly*, 1(8)
- Hoffer, E. (1951). *The True Believer*. New York, NY: Harper and Row
- Hogsdon, L. (2012). Facebook 2012 (Infographic). *The Blog Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.blogherald.com>
- Horowitz, D. (1970). *Counterculture and revolution*. New York, NY: Random House
- Howe, W. & Strauss, N. (1991). *Generations : The history of America's future*. New York, NY: William Morrow
- Hutton, Ronald (2001), *The stations of the sun: a history of the ritual year in Britain* (reprinted, illustrated ed.), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Jones, L (2008). *Great Expectations: America and the Baby Boom generation*. New York, NY: Coward McCann & Geoghegan
- Katsiaficas, T. (1987). *The imagination of the New Left: A global analysis of 1968*. Boston, MA: South End Press
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology* 5 (2)
- Lanier, J. (2010). *You are not a gadget: A manifesto*. New York, NY: Vintage

- Leen, J. (1999). The Vietnam protests: When worlds collided. *Washington Post*.
Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Liu, H. (2007). Social network profiles as taste performances. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*
- MacKinnon, R. (2011). Stop the great firewall of America. *The New York Times*.
Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Mehdizadeh, S. (2010). Self-presentation 2.0: Narcissism and self-esteem on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, Volume 13, 4*
- Nakamura, L. (2002). *Cybertypes: Race, ethnicity, and identity on the internet*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Noah, T. (2011). Hillarycare: The sequel. *The New York Times*. Retrieved at <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Older adults and social media. (2011). *Pew Internet & American Life Project*.
<http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Older-Adults-and-Social-Media/Report.aspx>.
- Paul, B. (2011). From People's Park to the Occupy Sacramento, Davis Movements. *Dixon Patch*. Retrieved from <http://dixon.patch.com>
- Pontell, J. (2009). *Generation Jones*. Retrieved from <http://www.generationjones.com>
- Preston, J (2011). Republicans sharpening online tools for 2012. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>

- Riggs, K. (2009). Baby Boomers: *Marketing and collective memory*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Marriott, Chicago, IL, May 20, 2009. Retrieved at <http://citation.allacedemic.com>
- Rogers, M. (2009). Boomers and Technology: An Extended Conversation. *AARP Publications*
- Roszak, T. (1969). *The making of a counter culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
- Turkle, S. (2005). *The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit*. Boston, MA: MIT Press
- Schlenker, B. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Scott, C., & Qian, H. (2007). Anonymity and self-disclosure on weblogs. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12
- Sloman, L. (1998). *Steal this dream*. New York, NY: Doubleday
- Smith, A. (2011). 22% of online Americans used social networking or Twitter for politics in 2010 campaign. *Pew Internet in American Life Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org>
- Smith, J. (2009). Fastest growing demographic on Facebook: Women over 55. Retrieved from <http://www.insidefacebook.com>
- Steinhorn, L. (2005). *The Greater Generation*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press

Steuer, J. (1992). Defining virtual reality: Dimensions determining telepresence.

Journal of Communication, 42

Stewart, J. (2011). An uprising with plenty of potential. *The New York Times*.

Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>

Sunden, J. (2003). *Material virtualities: Approaching online textual embodiment*.

New York, NY: Lang

Vargas,E. (2012). Spring awakening: How an Egyptian revolution began on

Facebook. *The New York Times*. Retrieved at <http://www.nytimes.com>

Wortham,J. (2012). Facebook readies timeline takeover. *The New York Times*.

Retrieved at <http://www.nytimes.com>.

Zickuhr, K. (2010). Generations 2010. *Pew Internet & American Life Survey*.

<http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Generations---2010.aspx>.

Appendix

Appendix 4.1.

Boomer Radical Facebook Samples, Radical Groups Selected From, Criteria for Radicalism, and Rhetorical Style.

<i>Identity</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Self-Describe</i>	<i>Like post</i>	<i>Write posts</i>	<i>Join Group</i>	<i>Friend</i>	<i>Rhetoric</i>
Craig R.	Original	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
M.A.J.	Late	Occupy	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
H. B.	Late	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
A.J.M.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Anarchy
Jim D.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Elliot E.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Adam C.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
C.B.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ed M.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
C. M.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ed K.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Joe P.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dave B.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
B.D.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Cultural
H. M.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Tom P.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Jan B.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
A.O.	Late	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Fran B.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Bill H.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Ron V.	Late	Occupy	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Political
Andy A.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Anarchy
S.H.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Mary G.	Original	Green	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Political
Zach R.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Pat B.	Original	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Jean M.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Vic F.	Original	Friend	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Cultural
Dan F.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dean E.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
B.T.	Late	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
H. S.	Late	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ed J.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
T.G.	Original	New Left	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Penny	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dan B.	Original	New Left	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural

<i>Identity</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Self-Describe</i>	<i>Like post</i>	<i>Write posts</i>	<i>Join Group</i>	<i>Friend</i>	<i>Rhetoric</i>
Bill A.	Original	New Left	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
T.H.	Original	New Left	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Cultural
S.W.	Original	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Wil A.	Original	Occupy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Joe B.	Original	Friend	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
P.A.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
D.E.	Late	Health	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
C.L.	Original	Health	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Tom S.	Late	Health	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
John M.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Mike F.	Original	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Rick S.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
D.B.	Late	Occupy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Scott A.	Late	Friend	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ash S.	Late	Friend	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural

Appendix 4.2.

Differences in Expression and Rhetorical Style of Original Radicals to Late Bloomer Radicals

<i>Identity</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Self-Describe</i>	<i>Like posts</i>	<i>Write posts</i>	<i>Join Groups</i>	<i>Friends</i>	<i>Rhetoric</i>
Craig S.	Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Elliott E.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Chuck M.	Original	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Fran B.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Bill H.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
S.H.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Mary G.	Original	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Political
Pat B.	Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Jean M.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ed J.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dan B.	Original	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
B.S.	Original	No	No	No	No	Yes	Cultural
Bill A.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
T.H.	Original	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Cultural
S.W.	Original	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Will A.	Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Joe B.	Original	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Charles L.	Original	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
T.G.	Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Mike F.	Original	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
A.J.M.	Original	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Anarchy
M.A.J.	Late	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Harry B.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Jim D.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Adam F.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
C.B.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Edward M.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ed K.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Joe P.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dave B.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
B.D.	Late	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Cultural
Harold M.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Tom P.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Janice B.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
A.O.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ron V.	Late	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Political
Andrew A.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Anarchy

<i>Name</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Self Describe</i>	<i>Like post</i>	<i>Write post</i>	<i>Join Group</i>	<i>Friend</i>	<i>Strategy</i>
Zach R.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dan F.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Dean E.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
B.T.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Harv S.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Penny V.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
P.A.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Donna E.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Political
Tom S.	Late	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
John M.	Late	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Rick S.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Denny B.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Scott A.	Late	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural
Ashley S.	Late	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cultural